

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the office action of October 19, 2007, in which he allowed claims 1 and 2, and rejected claims 3-11. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC §112¶2 as unclear, and the dependencies of claims 4-11 was improper according to the Examiner.

In response, claims 1 and 2 have remained unchanged. The dependencies of claims 4-11 have been amended without changing the original scope of the claims.

Claim 3 has been amended for clarification purposes. The phrase “[t]hat may” has been amended to “is configured to” which is clear and believed to overcome the §112, ¶2 rejection, and furthermore is consistent with the language of the other claims 1-2, and 4-11.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-11 are now believed to be allowable, and the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any remaining issues for patentability of the application, he is invited to contact the Applicant’s counsel at the number(s) listed below, so that the Application can proceed to issuance expeditiously.

Respectfully submitted,
Dort Patent, P.C.

/davidbogartdort50213/efs
David Bogart Dort
Reg. No. 50,213

Dated: December 18, 2007
Crystal City, VA
Customer No. 42389
202-423-1085